



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

because they tend to bring about conditions of opportunity and real freedom in a society where all are bound by ties of mutual dependence. "The pressure of mutual dependence is like the pressure of the atmosphere which is not felt because of the uniform balance of forces. Remove this balance and the pressure is crushing. Remove mutuality and dependence may degenerate into bondage. Therefore the prime problem of modern economic freedom is the maintenance of mutuality in relationships."

As the leaders of American legal opinion are still dominated by individualistic conceptions of abstract rights, Professor Ely's thesis, though commonplace among students of ethics and social science, might have been of great usefulness had not his handling of legal material been of such a slip-shod character. No student of law can be blamed for refusing to be impressed by a writer who fails to note that the Fifth Amendment to the Federal Constitution does not apply to the states (p. 694). It is not merely that Professor Ely falls down on legal details. His whole conception of the Bills of Rights and the function of courts is hazy and innocent of any grasp of the real difficulties. On the fundamental question of the relation of property to contract he is content with the bare dogmatic statement that "our idea of property carries with it the right of contract" (p. 555). But this is far from being a general truth. As Dean Pound has shown, in a famous article in the *Yale Law Review*, it is but a late invention of the American courts.

MORRIS R. COHEN.

College of the City of New York.

THE SOCIAL PROBLEM: A CONSTRUCTIVE ANALYSIS. By Charles A. Ellwood. New York: Macmillan, 1916. Pp. 258.

Professor Ellwood proposes "to furnish a brief analysis of the social problem in Western civilization and to outline a scientific social philosophy which shall serve as a basis for a well-balanced progress."

Successive chapters rehearse the following aspects of the undertaking: historical elements in the modern social problem; physical and biological elements; economic elements; spiritual and ideal elements; and a final chapter dealing with the solution of the social problem. The standpoint and conclusions are not new, for they embody a trend of academic sociology in the United

States. More than some other sociologists, however, Professor Ellwood stands for the view that ideas, "spiritual factors," are the prime agents of social development. He is moved to attack the position of the biologists who claim that eugenics is a final word, to assail the determinism of the economist and the selfishness and materialism of the capitalist, to hold that modern science has partly been directed to ends which prevent the community from realizing an harmonious life; and finally to urge the need of a revaluation of family, government, morality, and religion.

So strong is the conviction of the writer that religion is a prime necessity in a progressive civilization that he may fairly be classified among the advocates of a religious sociology. For western civilization he identifies religion with Christianity. Whether it is possible to formulate and to make appealing to the multitude a religion which is both sociologically proper and Christian is an item lending itself to more extended discussion than is given. The hortatory tone, the appeal to individual benevolence (as when the author urges the capitalist to change his heart and his methods) and the partiality for the terms "unselfish" and "altruism" are almost ecclesiastical. The seeming acceptance of a dualism of egoism and altruism caused by a loose use of terms adapted to popular reading is unfortunate in the light of recent ethical criticism and insight into human nature.

What is said about the primacy of individual character, the insufficiency of external machinery and negative theories of life and society is undoubtedly true. Nevertheless, the reader wonders whether Dr. Ellwood advances beyond an already familiar first act in the drama: an outline of the complexities and interrelations of the problem, with the repeated sociological reminder to see all the factors together, to reform the family, humanize industry, reprove the revolutionist, warn the conservative, remodel education, and train wise leaders. After the plot has been told as Professor Ellwood narrates it, only a formal beginning has been made. To observe and think in terms of the Great Society, to psychologize and revise methods of communal organization so that they may become fit vehicles of human nature, to induce a general willingness to experiment and to abide by possible losses as well as to enjoy gains which follow from trying social hypotheses,—most of these things are still to do. They demand comprehensive programs applied to specific issues. Their general necessity has been stated in one way or another by various social

philosophies, including that of Professor Ellwood; but the real test of a sociology is in invention and action. This means selecting crucial problems, throwing a white light on their ramifications, surveying each aspect exactly, giving the interests involved their relative and just valuation, and formulating means and end in a workable plan. An extension of the "social survey" is the enterprise which the present international tension calls for.

Professor Ellwood aptly concludes by saying that upon the university of the future rests a sacred responsibility to train youth to think and act in terms of social causation. "Social leaders" must be available. Just what, in the coming years, is to be the mutual relation between the social expert and the community to be guided? The question, still unpursued in a comprehensive manner, seems particularly congenial to the method of sociology, and well adapted, if successfully worked out, to free it from the burden of exhortation and apology under which the church and conventional doctrines of ethics now labor. Will this synthesis also be left to Mr. Wells?

E. L. TALBERT.

University of Cincinnati.

WHAT IS LIVING AND WHAT IS DEAD OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF HEGEL. By Bendetto Croce. Translation from the Italian by Douglas Ainalie, B. A. London: Macmillan & Co., 1915. Pp. xviii, 217.

English readers of Croce's works already know him as a thinker who philosophises from a fundamentally Hegelian point of view. They will not be required, therefore, to find him maintaining in this book that the element of permanency in the philosophy of Hegel is the synthesis of opposites in the concrete universal. Only the concrete universal, it is held, and consequently only the Hegelian philosophy, can give an adequate conception of reality, for the reason that a reality is neither simply the one side of any pair of opposites, nor the other, nor yet again the mere opposites of the two, but their synthesis. Croce conceives Hegel to have made the attempt to render thought, which naturally tends to assume a rigid expression, as fluid as is the real. For he had no doubt that the real is fluid, and hence it was that Heracleitus appealed to him; and he felt at the same time that all previous philosophies had been unfaithful to this